

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Rt. No. 35/AIL/Lab./J/2011, dated 10th February 2011)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I.D. No. 1/2010, dated 17-9-2010 of the Labour Court, Karaikal in respect of the industrial dispute raised by the Bharathiyan College of Engineering and Technology Non-Teaching Staff Union, Karaikal against the management of M/s. Bharathiyan College of Engineering and Technology, Karaikal over change in the conditions of service of the workers like withdrawal of canteen facility has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G. O. Ms.No.20/91/Lab/L, dated 23-5-91, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT, KARAIKAL

*Present : Tmt. R. MARGARET ROSALINE, M.L.
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
Additional District Judge, Karaikal.*

Wednesday, the 17th day of September 2010.

I.D.No. 1/2010

The Honorary President,
Bharathiyan College of Engineering and
Technology Non-teaching Staff Union,
Gnanajothy Illam,
4th Lane, Kothalampet Road,
Senior Kulam Street, Karaikal. . . Petitioner

Versus

The Management,
Bharathiyan College of Engineering and
Technology, Thiruvettakudi,
Karaikal. . . Respondent

This case coming on 17-9-2010 hearing before the petitioner and the respondent being called absent, and on perusing the case records, this court passed the following:

AWARD

This industrial dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government under section 10(l)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act in G.O.Rt.No. 156/AIL/LAB/J/2009, dated 10-12-2009 in and by which the following references were made to this court for adjudication.

(a) Whether the dispute raised by the Bharathiyan College of Engineering and Technology Non-Teaching Staff Union, Karaikal against the management of M/s. Bharathiyan College of Engineering and Technology, Karaikal over change in the conditions of service of the workers like withdrawal of canteen facility is justified or not?

(b) If justified, to give appropriate directions?

2. RPAD served on petitioner. No representation made. Hence industrial dispute is closed.

Written and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 17th day of September 2010.

R. MARGARET ROSALINE,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court.
Karaikal.

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Rt. No. 36/AIL/Lab./J/2011, dated 10th February 2011)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in LD. No. 9/2008, dated 20-11-2010 of the Labour Court, Karaikal in respect of the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Nallathur Co-operative Milk Society Ltd., Nallathur and Tmt. G. Veeramani Dania over non-employment has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No.20/91/Lab/L, dated 23-5-91, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT, KARAIKAL

*Present : Tmt. R. MARGARET ROSALINE, M.L.
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
District Judge, Karaikal.*

Saturday, the 20th day of November 2010.

I.D.No. 9/2008

Thiru G. Veeramani Dania,
Mela Velangudi, Nanilam T.K.
Thiruvarur District. . . Petitioner

Versus

The Nallathur Co-operative Milk Society Ltd.,
Nallathur P.O., Nedungadu,
Karaikal. . . Respondent

This case coming on 12-11-2010 in the presence of Thiru P. Muthukrishnan, advocate for the petitioner, and the respondent being called absent and set *ex parte*, and on hearing the petitioner, and on perusing the case records, this court passed the following:

AWARD

This industrial dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government under section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act in GO.Rt.No. 147/AIL/Lab/J/2008, dated 18-9-2008 in and by which the following references were made to this court for adjudication.

(a) Whether the dispute raised by Tmt. G. Veeramani Dania against the management of M/s. Nallathur Co-operative Milk Society Ltd., Nallathur, Karaikal over non-employment is justified or not?

(b) To what relief, Tmt. G. Veeramani Dania is entitled to?

(c) To compute the relief, if any awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed?

2. Order passed. As the petitioner has proved her claim through the Ex.P. 1 to Ex.P.8, the award is passed directing the respondent to reinstate the petitioner forthwith without back wages but with continuity of service. No costs.

Written and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 20th day of November 2010.

R. MARGARET ROSALINE,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
Karaikal.

List of witnesses examined by the petitioner :

PW1—G. Veeramani Dania

List of exhibits marked by the petitioner :

Ex.P1—Office order, dated 30-6-1995 issued to the petitioner by the respondent society.

Ex.P2—Proceedings of the respondent, dated 0-10-1998

Ex.P3—Notice, dated 13-12-2007 issued by the respondent.

Ex.P4—Explanation by the petitioner, dated 4-1-2008.

Ex.P5—Xerox copy of reply given by the petitioner, dated 18-1-2008.

Ex.P6—Letter by petitioner to the Conciliation Officer, dated 13-2-2008.

Ex.P7—Letter by the respondent to the Conciliation Officer, dated 28-5-2008

Ex.P8—Failure report, dated 9-7-2008.

R. MARGARET ROSALINE,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
Karaikal.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(GO. Rt. No. 20/AIL/Lab./J/2011, dated 3rd February 2011)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute has raised by Hindustan Unilever Employees Union against the management of M/s. Hindustan Unilever Limited, Detergent Division, Vadamanagal, Puducherry over change of service conditions of their workmen in respect of the matter mentioned in the Annexure to this order;

And whereas in the opinion of the Government, it is necessary to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority delegated *vide* G.O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab., dated 23-5-1991 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to exercise the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour), that the said dispute be referred to the Industrial Tribunal, Puducherry for adjudication. The Industrial Tribunal, Puducherry shall submit the award within 3 months from the date of issue of reference as stipulated under sub-section (2-A) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and in accordance with rule 10-B of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957. The party raising the dispute shall file a statement of claim complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses to the Industrial Tribunal, Puducherry within 15 days of the receipt of the order of reference and also forward a copy of such statement to each one of the opposite parties involved in the dispute.

ANNEXURE

(a) Whether the dispute raised by Hindustan Unilever Employees Union (Registration No. 1534/RTU/2008), Puducherry against the management of M/s. Hindustan Unilever Limited, Detergents Division, Vadamanagal, Puducherry over change of service conditions of their workmen without adhering section 9A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and violation of 12(3) settlement, dated 10-5-2007 is justified or not?

(b) If not justified, what relief, their workmen are entitled to? And what conditions should be adopted?

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).